DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 143 HE 006 870

AUTHOR McLean, Sandi, Ed.
TITLE Challenges of the Presidency.
INSTITUTION American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 23p.; Papers presented at the Biennial Summer Council of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (5th, Jackson Hole, Wyoming, July 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Centralization; *Educational Assessment; Educational Finance; *Educational Objectives; Enrollment; Faculty; Financial Support; *Organizational Effectiveness; Policy Formation; *Post Secondary Education; *Presidents; Public Support; Students; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

"Challenges of the Presidency" explores the circumstances and forces that affect the college president's leadership in identifying and accomplishing the educational mission of the institution. These four papers examine the external forces of government and population trends as well as the internal pressures from faculty and students, and offer different perspectives on the actions to be taken and the expected outcomes. Issues dealt with are: (1) maintenance of quality education in the face of declining enrollments, decreasing public support to higher education, faculty cuts, and weakening student commitment to education; (2) institutional efficiency in state systems; (3) centralization, financing, and enrollments as challenges to the presidency; and (4) definitions of an institution, institutional effectiveness, and institutional evaluation. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

Challenges of the Presidency

Papers from the Fifth Biennial Summer Council of Presidents

Roland Dille
Fred Harcleroad
Kenneth Lindner
Kenneth Young

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 006 870

aascu

The following papers were presented at the Fifth Biennial Summer Council of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Jackson Hole, Wyoming, July 6-10, 1975.

"Challenges of the Presidency," the theme of the Summer Council, explores the circumstances and forces which affect the President's leadership to identify and accomplish the educational mission of the institution. The four papers examine the external forces of government and population trends as well as the internal pressures from faculty and students; and offer different perspectives on the actions to be taken and the expected outcome.

AASCU is an organization of 317 regional state colleges and universities located in 47 states, the District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands. Two-thirds of them have graduate programs. Many offer less-than-baccalaureate programs leading to associate degrees or certification. They represent the fastest-growing group of four-year institutions in the nation, with an enrollment of approximately 2.5 million--25 percent of the total national student population, and 30 percent of those in four-year institutions.

Allan W. Ostar
Executive Director

Sandi McLean
Editor

American Association of State Colleges
and Universities
One Dupont Circle, NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036

MAINTAINING QUALITY EDUCATION:

HOW TO DO MORE WITH LESS

Roland Dille

President, Moorhead State College, Minnesota

In May I received a letter from one of our fellow presidents, who is responsible for one of this morning's panels, asking for a copy of this paper. Suddenly, a whole new world opened up to me, a world in which college presidents did not write their speeches at the last minute, where budgets are prepared long before legislative sessions, where desks are clean, where memos appear as if by magic.

That has not been my world.

And so, a week ago Saturday, I found myself saying to my wife, "Come hell or high water, I'll finish my paper this week-end." High water, indeed, within a few hours, my wife and I and the campus of Moorhead State College stood about in the middle of a million acres of flooded farm-land. I was, additionally, surrounded by several hundred displaced migrant workers, and I spent much of last week with them and with a number of other problems resulting from the flood; and finished the paper before breakfast this morning.

I mention this not by way of apology and not merely to give you a glimpse of a man of action but to remind you of two things. First, events have a way of establishing priorities. What was the most important task I faced last week? Getting this paper written? Taking care of migrants? Something else? The question never arose. If you agree with me that developing quality education is our most important task, that we must give it first priority, you also probably will agree that a great many things probably will interfere with our coming to grips with that task.

I mentioned the flood for another reason. It is estimated that the flood resulted in one-and-a-half billion dollars of lost farm income in the area from which we draw many of our students. How much faith can we put in our planning in a world of such accidents? Looking ahead, we know that all kinds of things over which we have no control will put our plans into disarray.

The world of the college president has never been very safe, of course. We look back to a period of growth and prosperity, to the golden age of the 'sixties. But those of us--and we may be a minority now--who were presidents in 1968-1970 can tell you about that golden age and about those high spirited youngsters who burned buildings or threatened to.

I just finished my seventh year as president. I feel like Jacob, who, you remember, fell in love with Rachel and was told by her father, Laban, that he could marry Rachel if he worked for seven years. When, at the end of seven years, he went to Laban, he was given Leah, the elder daughter, and was told that he must work seven more years for Rachel. I'm not sure that ever Rachel is worth another seven years, and, what is sadder, no one is promising us Rachel.

Or anything else in that uncertain future. The city of Moorhead is this summer celebrating its centennial, and I was asked to contribute a letter to a time-capsule, to be read by the citizens of Moorhead in the year 2075. That was, in a profound way, an unsettling experience. The only thing I could think to write was, "Hey, man! This is like really weird."

As we look to the future, I think, we are asking ourselves the right question: how do we do more with less? It is the Great Challenge, and we can take some small comfort from the fact that we have prepared for it by successfully meeting an earlier challenge--how to do less with more.

Let us begin by reminding ourselves of what exactly is meant by "less."

First, let us take it as a given fact that our enrollments will decline. There have been some optimistic predictions. I don't believe them. And even if I did, I wouldn't dare to plan on the basis of these predictions; I cannot ignore changing population patterns already reflected in lower public school enrollments. Indeed, with the rural-urban migration still continuing, many of us already have seen a drop in high school graduating classes in the regions from which we have traditionally drawn our students.

Moreover, a smaller percentage of high school graduates will be going on to college. The drop is already significant. Whether or not we believe that this is a temporary condition depends on the reasons to which we ascribe the change. I think that we delude ourselves by talking about cycles, for although there are many reasons why students decide not to go to college, reasons that may be altered or that may disappear, the most important reason, and it is the most obvious, is that a college degree no longer seems to guarantee a better job. This is not just the result of an economic recession from which we can hope to escape eventually. Most of us have had good reason to face the consequences of the end of the shortage of elementary and secondary teachers. All of us are familiar with the claim by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that only 20 percent of the jobs filled in the 'seventies will require a college degree, and that this will drop to 17 percent in the 'eighties; that there will be 800,000 "excess" graduates between now

and 1985.

We face a further problem in the certain disadvantages that our colleges have in the competition for students. Leaving aside the great increase in the number of vocational-technical schools, most of us would wish that there were fewer community colleges around. As costs rise, many of our potential first and second year students will disappear into community colleges nearer their homes. And I guess that I do mean disappear, because, as the baccalaureate degree loses its lustre, the two-year degree will be, for more and more students, the terminal degree. The competition with the major state universities will not lessen. If they seem about to fall into serious difficulties, they will once again be shown to be the favorites of legislatures. And, I am afraid, the private colleges will succeed in gaining the kinds of legislation that will allow them to compete more easily with us for students. This will not be solely because the private colleges have persuaded legislators of their value and their virtue. It will be chiefly because new patterns of student aid will work to the advantages of private colleges.

This brings me to a second dimension of the less: new patterns of student aid will develop out of the disinclination of the public to support higher education as it has been supported in the past. Higher tuition, to replace public support, is, I believe inevitable. Higher levels of student aid will, as Allan Ostar has argued so well, fall far short of meeting the individual needs resulting from higher tuition. But the public will not much care, because they will have become convinced, are right now being convinced that first, there is no need for as many graduates as we would like to produce; and, second, the benefits of college are individual, not public benefits, and that he who benefits should pay. This is another reason to expect a decline in enrollments, but even more, this loss of a public faith in and commitment to education means a drop in funding for education regardless of how many or how few students we have.

There is a third dimension of the less, and that has to do with the faculty contribution to the enterprise. Because colleges of many sizes have been healthy and prosperous, enrollment declines may strike laymen as no particular threat to education. To our sorrow, we know better. Decline means that we are caught with too many programs, and, paradoxically, with too little freedom to add still others. We are caught with too many tenured faculty with small hope for new, young and vigorous faculty. We are forced into decisions that cut even tenured faculty. It is hard on us; it is even harder on the faculty.

Threatened, uneasy, uncertain, and suspicious, faculties force us into new relationships with them. Unionization is a result, a sympton, and a cause. Unionization or no unionization, faculty feel less involved in an enterprise that is truly theirs, and they will surely, therefore, become less committed. They will give less, are more likely simply to go through the motions. That is perhaps our greatest loss.

A fourth dimension of the less has to do with students. Like the public and the faculty, they too have a weakened commitment to higher education. For those of us who taught, rather than administered, in the Golden Age of education, the age was golden not because there were so many students, but because there were so many students eager to learn. I do not think that that is merely an old man's nostalgia for a time when he was doing something worthwhile, for there seems to be general agreement that contemporary students do not write very well, that bad writing is in part a reflection of an uncertain group of habits of logical thought, that they do not read well or much, that they are less open to the joys of intellectual discovery, and that they find rigorousness a less acceptable demand than they once did. The 19th Century novel, perhaps the greatest tool for learning that modern education ever requisitioned from the general culture, is no longer much used. Such novels are too long. Added to these academic defects, and partly the reason for them, is a new set of values. Talk about it in whatever terms you will, self-indulgence is a way of life, instant gratification an aim of life. We have not returned to the 'fifties. The new breed of student, perhaps so preferable to the 60's breed, is, even in his willingness to get about his assignments, dominated by the new ethic. Those of us who have praised their vocational interests as signs of maturity, seriousness, and the long view, need to be concerned about vocationalism wedded to the higher self-indulgence. It seems to me to be a threat to quality education, so far as that kind of education addresses itself to a broadening and the deepening of the individual experience.

This pessimism about students is not, of course, new. Let me read some lines of William Wordsworth, written near the end of the 18th Century, in which he remembers his days at Cambridge

> Be wise,
> Ye Presidents and Deans, and, till the spirit
> Of ancient times revive, and youth be trained
> At home in pious service, to your bells
> Give seasonable rest, for 't is a sound
>
> Hollow as ever vexed the tranquil air;
> ... Different sight
> Those venerable Doctors saw of old,
> When all who dwelt within these famous walls
> Led in abstemiousness a studious life;
> When, in forlorn and naked chambers cooped
> And crowded, o'er the ponderous books they hung
> Like caterpillars eating out their way
> In silence.
> ...in that glorious time
> When Learning, like a stranger come from far,
> ...
> ...when boys and youths
> ...
> Journeyed with ponderous folios in their hands;
> And often, starting from some covert place,
> Saluted the chance comer on the road,
> Crying, "An obolus, a penny give
> To a poor scholar!"

That last part sounds a little like our external degree program.

State colleges once said about students that "we take them where they are." Now we say, "we take them where they're at." What a change in expectations is mirrored in that change in words!

A fifth dimension of the less is the confusion of our purposes. We always have done best when we were certain that what we were doing was of utmost importance; even when we were misguided. It is entirely proper that questions have been raised. I would be happier if we had raised them ourselves. But if our uncertainties in some ways prove our right to our calling, uncertainty is ever a poor guide.

To return to Jacob, we have--and the analogy is exact--exchanged our birthright for a mess of pottage. It was bad enough to follow fads out of philosophy. Now we do it in search of the panacea that will save our lives.

What governs most college decisions--our purposes, if you will--is the desire to save the jobs of those who have them. Beyond that, most of our colleges, right now, have no sense of purpose that will require us to do some things or keep us from doing others.

There you have the five dimensions of the "less." The first draft of this paper called on me to make a colorful gesture at this point, like cutting my throat.

How, then, do we meet the challenge of the less, at some level beyond simple survival? How do we prove our right to our positions by actually doing more?

And how do we define the "more?"

Let me do it simply: to do more means to provide a better education for those who come to us for classes and degrees. It means to get beyond certification; to provide the learning that will make our graduates happier. I chose that word "happier" with care, because it seems to be the only word that includes such things as self-fulfillment, that is, developing as many talents and tastes as possible and recognizing how wide is the range of possibilities; such things as being useful and the desire to be useful; as understanding self and coming to so many of the other kinds of understanding.

What do we need to bring about this better education?

The first great need is for authority. The decisions that will make us flexible, that will make us responsive, are tough decisions. Faculties in the 'fifties and students in the 'sixties, expressing legitimate concerns for participation, have left us with governance systems that cannot easily make tough decisions. We need a show of naked power. Well, we don't, of course, but I wanted to use those words because this is the first audience I've ever spoken to that might appreciate them. But we do need something more than the velvet glove covering the marshmallow fist.

I think we must, each of us, begin the political process that will bring coordinating commissions, state college boards, chancellors, legislatures, courts, arbitrators, contract negotiators, and the public face-to-face with necessity. We cannot be responsible, we cannot be accountable. without authority.

But authority, by itself, will not do the job. If we succeed in gaining the necessary authority, we must convince our faculties, by a precise description of both the present and the future, that a crisis does indeed exist. We must show them the nature of the crisis, persuade them that an orderly retreat is preferable to chaos, and bring them to an acceptance of the inevitability of presidential power.

And then, what we have taken with the left hand we must give with the right. Not rejecting authority, but sharing it out again, but this time into a system that accepts urgency as it once accepted delay. The new governance system must be guided by the facts that action will be taken, that we cannot eat our cake and have it, that we seek not the perfect good but the least bad. I think we not only must say, but we had better believe, that collective wisdom, if it can be harnessed, is better than our single wisdom.

It is terribly important that, having regained authority, we re-establish community. I believe that this will require not only a new system of governance, but a re-entry of ourselves into the lives of the faculty. We must learn to work with faculty on a very personal level. As to governance, I think that it may require more task forces than standing committees. Further, I believe that doing away with the fiction of faculty control will be less traumatic if faculty come to see a speedy response to their contributions, if discussions are focussed, and if they are followed by action.

The right system is, of course, the one that works. I think that to make a system work we must be willing and able to develop our own plans, we must be ready to modify them, we must make certain that the right things are discussed, and we will have to indicate clearly the nature of disagreements and our reasons for acting against committee opinions.

And, always, we must recognize our desperate need for community.

Underlying all of this, is the proper use of information. Faculties may not always yield to the evidence, but they are less likely to feel betrayed if they know what the evidence is.

We must know where our money goes. And we must know what we get for it.

All of this has been much talked of, and most of us have the men and machines that can provide the necessary information. But we badly need a system that we

ourselves understand. We need an easily manageable mangerial system, with less calculus and more clarity.

This is important for us, and it is important for our faculties. Clark Kerr says that it is his impression that "a great many faculty still do not realize that this is a new and different phase in the history of American higher education and that this new phase will have consequences for them." One great use of information is to spread it around.

All of this--greater authority, new decision-making systems, more information--will require us to re-examine our roles. The "in" word now is manager. In a recent article in the New York Times, Richard Cyert, president of Carnegie-Mellon, was identified as the "archetype of the new breed of leaders." "Traditionally," Cyert says, "colleges have not been managed at all." Managers talk a good deal about "productivity" and "cost-effectiveness," words that jar a bit in the context of conventional presidential rhetoric.

Some of you may be managers. I confess to some suspicion of these hard-eyed men, these "unfrocked Marines," to use a phrase of Tom Lehrer. I began this paper by suggesting my own lack of organization. I suspect that deep down I think that this is rather charming. But it really won't do. Without approaches more systematic than we have in the past found congenial, we can handle neither our jobs nor our colleges.

The end of all of this is, of course, planning. The beginning of planning is an agreement on purposes. I earlier mentioned our general confusion about purposes. We cannot, I'm afraid, wait until the philosophical discussions are ended before we ask the practical questions. Again, I quote Clark Kerr: "What should the missions of the institution be? To what extent should they be cut down to the fundamentals? To what extent should they be changed? For example, what should be the role of teacher education under the circumstances that are likely to prevail over the next decade or two?"

Again and again, we must ask ourselves what we can do well. Because we cannot do everything well, because we cannot even do as many things well as we have in the past, we will have to learn to think knowledgeably about such matters as cost-effectiveness. But if our aim is, indeed, quality education, if we really are interested in doing things well, we will have to get beyond numbers: numbers of students, of courses, of credit hours. We will have to define quality, and we will have to learn how to evaluate.

We are, of course, no strangers to talk about the efficient use of resourses, but often we have not approached the subject with a readiness to examine old assupmtions. L. Richard Meeth recently suggested that we challenge some assumptions which, if not very basic, are usually unquestioned. He points at assumptions about the value of Ph.D. faculty, the need for large, central libraries, athletics, and food services; the usefulness of distribution requirements, and conventional wisdom about class size. He believes that it is only through an examination of such assumptions and a willingness to act upon the results of such an examination that we will make the "economies that allow flexibility and that support other programs at the needed level."

Such decisions are hard to make, especially as so many of them will threaten faculties, and this at a time when perhaps our greatest need is to keep faculties productively happy. Stephen Bailey believes that "much can still be done to increase faculty spirit and enhance faculty development during hard times." Faculty spirit and faculty development are closely related, for the most productive faculty members are those who take joy from the knowledge of jobs well done. Bailey suggests such things as temporary load reductions for developing courses, the use of technology to lighten loads, post doctoral fellowships and sabbaticals, money for travel and conferences, new challenges for bored faculty members in interdisciplinary projects, and leaves for re-training. We must seek ways for faculties to enrich their professional lives and out of such satisfaction re-establish their loyalty to the enterprise. The losses we sustain from our inability to hire new, young faculty will be off-set only from some kind of enrichment.

Finally, I do not believe we can talk about quality education without talking about general education. We are now in a time when the liberal arts are, for some of our faculty, the last bastion of civilization and, for other faculty, students, and legislators, a joke.

Neither of these views is useful. If we are going to talk about fulfillment, about understanding, about responsibility, we are going to have to provide the kind of learning that will lead to those ends. Call it what you will, this is general education based, however distantly, on the liberal arts.

Affirm that kind of education as you will, the fact remains that it has not done a very good job. Only great teachers can make it work in today's circumstances. And we don't have enough of them. The hand of the discipline-centered curriculum that rests upon instruction is, if not a dead hand, at least not a very lively one. Inter-disciplinary courses have done something but not enough.

We need a restructuring--one that will not ignore the past, but that will confront the future. The new curriculum must be sound enough to excite the faculty, and immediate enough to excite students. Above all, it must be free from departmental control.

That word "immediate" sounds like an echo of a 'sixties call for relevance. Let me hasten to say that I believe that some of our responses to that call are partly responsible for the present state of general education. General education will have its necessary impact only if curriculum is so structured as to bring students into a full

participation in the process of learning. That means, first of all, that they have a sense of movement towards knowledge and understanding. This is scarcely a new hope for the classroom, but I believe that the emphasis of competency-based learning can redirect our efforts; that we can learn to identify, very precisely, the objectives of curricula and courses and that we can, further, develop the processes of planning and organization that will move our students firmly towards the mastery of those objectives.

Let me, in closing, move, as it were, from the general to the abstract.

We face difficult times. We may very well find little joy in our jobs. But, if we are truly committed to good education, we may find satisfactions greater than we have ever found before. The fact is that quality has seldom, and then never for long, dominated our discussions--or our actions. If we now, for once, judge every decision on the oasis of its impact on quality, we may come, finally, to a justification of ourselves and our jobs.

INSTITUTIONAL EFFICIENCY IN STATE SYSTEMS OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

Fred Harcleroad
Director and Professor, Department of Higher Education, University of Arizona

Just a little over a year ago, a president reported that it cost his institution over $300,000 in travel costs and in staff time to go to various state meetings and to the state headquarters to obtain the budget for the fiscal year. This was the beginning of, or at least the impetus for, a study of the impact of state-wide control in terms of institutional effeciency, effectiveness and cost. The study was conducted among AASCU member institutions and while the report is not yet final, there are some salient points I would like to summarize at this time. Almost two-thirds of the AASCU institutions returned usable questionnaires with enough regional distribution to make the survey respresentative. The comparisons that follow will relate to approximately 200 responding institutions.

The trend since 1969 has been toward more coordination, and, on the basis of survey responses, in many cases a substantial increase in coordination with a direct influence on the individual institutions. The Education Commission of the States conducted a survey of the structure of state coordinating or governing boards and institutional and local campus governing boards as of January 1, 1975. It appears in Volume 4, Number Two of "Higher Education in the States." Summarizing this I found some changes taking place of which you should be aware. One change is the development of the Secretary of Education. There are four of them now and a number of states are considering the office. This has long-term significance for the operation of institutions because it is a completely different concept in administering education in the states. The Secretary of Education takes education as a whole from being a fourth branch of the government and makes it part of the executive branch of government. Students of public administration and political sciences will recognize this as a very significant change. In addition, there are now at least eight and possibly nine states in which the person in charge of higher education serves in the cabinet of the governor. Even though there is no secretary of education, serving in the governor's cabinet makes education just another cabinet agency. Once again, that is a very significant change. There have been changes since 1965 in 36 of the states, all of them leading toward more control at the central level over the institutions and their operations.

Only 7.4 percent of the institutions that responded to the questionnaire considered their state coordination body to be weak, with limited advisory powers; 92 percent believed they had a pretty strong central coordinating body with a lot of control. Furthermore, two-thirds of the institutions feel the pressure of additional control from the executive offices in addition to a coordinating body. In Montana, for example, all reporting institutions indicated a great increase in the power of the executive.

To the question, "Do the coordinating and governing boards actually know their various institutions?", most institutions reported that the state or the system board members do know the different institutions fairly well. Exceptions are scattered institutions in the South, and every reporting institution in the Pacific region. The same reaction was true regarding the question, "The liberalization and mobilization of human resources or each campus--are they actually trying to provide for them?" Although a high proportion of the institutions replied yes in some fashion to this, almost half of the institutions in the Western census region responded flaty, no: there is no provision for making use of the human resources on the campuses for the benefit of the total higher education program. Thus, the current situation shows an increase in state coordination in government and a mixed reaction to this in various regions.

In 1971, AASCU's statement of institutional rights and responsibilities analyzed the levels of decision-making for nine different functions. The current study attempts to obtain evaluation of the effectiveness of central offices in terms of some of these functions: long-range planning, budget review and approval, fiscal operations, building construction, program allocations, personnel selections; and then subtopics such as purchasing, printing, and selection of architects.

Some of the most interesting effectiveness data related to the process of long-range planning and to the quality of the resulting state-wide institutional master plans. Only in the middle Atlantic and southern Atlantic regions did as much as 26 percent and 40 percent of the institutions respectively answer yes regarding the improvement in the planning process. For the nation as a whole, only one-sixth of the institutions thought the process of long-range planning had been improved. That is a very significant finding because the chief claim made for state coordination is that the long-range planning process and the planning results are improved. There are instances throughout the nation where it is safe and fair to say that the planning process is much better. But five-sixths of the presidents didn't think it had been improved at all.

The data regarding planning provide another indication of one of the general findings of the study: the differentiation between the 50 states is very marked. The historical development varies so greatly that only trends can be reported. In addition, the findings are quite mixed in the various functional areas. In several states that are highly centralized, I have reports from the institutions that purchasing procedures have been improved. On the other hand, almost everyone reports that it takes longer to receive orders, there is more paper work, and sometimes you don't get what you asked for in the first place. Cost savings as a result of increased state coordination are seldom documented, but additional costs are seldom specified.

One question included a list of 16 different areas for evaluation and one southwestern institution answered that there had been increased controls in all of the areas and with decreased efficiency. A New England institution responded in the same vein. All business procedures have become more difficult and time comsuming because of the new bureaucratic layer in the commission office.

An example of the increase in bureaucratic procedures can be found in the New York committee report on "Interagency relationships with the State University of New York," which documents six basic housekeeping agencies and 12 other agencies that are quasi-state agencies with control over institutional expenses or activities in some way. Within the executive budget there are some 50 agencies, most of which might have some effect on the institution at some time.

The New York committee found that the relationships with the agencies, plus the SUNY central office, definitely increased paper work and cost for the colleges. How much actual cost is difficult to find. In the area of vouchers, three state agencies plus the SUNY central office must agree before an order can be processed and a bill paid in New York. One college reported that a group of vouchers was rejected because the supporting documents were folded improperly.

One-half of the institutions are free of the pernicious practices of central purchasing: those in New England and the East South Central census regions have the most freedom. Either there is no centralized purchasing, or it is optional with the institution to participate. Twenty-three percent of the institutions report no central purchasing, 20 percent report that it is optional, 35 percent report that a majority of the purchasing is done centrally, and 12 percent report that all purchasing is done centrally. In Georgia, a centralized state, one very complete reply indicated that delays resulted, but that the institution has been able to save considerable money. Optional centralized purchasing seems preferable to mandatory centralized purchasing in terms of savings. For example, a state college in New England received a cheaper bid on fuel oil through a local consortium than through the state contract. But the state contract would not allow the college to buy the fuel oil at a cheaper rate even though it petitioned and tried to do it.

In the printing and binding area, one-third of the institutions have autonomy in purchasing printing, and another one-sixth can choose between state and local printers. One college reported that small printing jobs are done on campus in a state-operated printing department and that larger jobs through the state department purchasing and are handled efficiently in a cooperative manner and at a savings. Having the campus printing shop designated as a state printing agency is an interesting idea, and may circumvent some problems.

Problems with formula budgeting also were documented by several institutions. One southern university cited six major problems. For example, it has many older buildings with higher maintenance costs than the formulas provided for. The unit costs were more for institutions which were in the smaller category size. The use of trend lines in the formulas is a problem because it is very hard to adjust the formula when the trend is reversed. This is becoming evident as populations go down. Temporary or permanent changes in trend lines which really are not taken into account are a problem. Central staff often gives very limited time for review of its recommendations based on the formula budget. In one instance that was cited the institution received the recommended budget late Friday afternoon and was to respond early Monday morning. This seems to be fairly typical, because the central office usually is understaffed and the staff is rushed; they get it late and they get it to the institution with barely enough time to make the legislative deadline. That situation was suggested several times. A basic problem in formula budgeting is that often formulas are not elastic enough and do not change to meet present day needs. Budget formulas can be set to accomadate different kinds of groups or different needs. But that is a question of where you start, and how well you build the budget beyond where you started; leaving enough flex in it so that the institution can make the adjustments, otherwise formula budgeting can be a very difficult problem.

Personnel rules and salary determination varied dramatically between the states--very, very dramatically. Thirty-eight percent of the respondents stated that the coordinating body leaves salary determination to the discretion of the individual institution. That is almost two in five institutions, which is a surprising figure as I usually hear the other side of the story. Another 34 percent said only general salary levels are established by the institution. So, about two-thirds of the institutions have considerable flexibility. I am used to hearing from the other one-third, which has no flexibility whatsoever; even some of the salaries of secretaries were set in the state controller's office, the executive office, the governor's office, or the state coordination office. Some institutions do have reports of extreme control by civil service commissions, state personnel boards, and, in a few states, such as in New York, the Office of Employee Relations and the Public Employment Relations Boards; and, in Pennsyl-

vania, the various executive offices for collective bargaining.

These selected items give some idea of the findings of part of the study. Many others are available and will be included in the final report when it comes out in the next few months. The direction appears to be toward less autonomy rather than more, even in many operational areas. The chief problems of some generality appear to be following.

First, there are too many varied bodies to work with on budgets, far too many. This increases costs in time and travel. In the one documented case I mentioned earlier it cost over $300,000 to make the budget for one state university.

Second, there are too many agencies involved to make needed adjustments rapidly. Budgets that are prepared a year and a half to two years in advance, or even only 15 months or a year in advance, often can't take in account changing needs. I did note some positive exceptions. In Georgia the Board of Regents obtained approval from the governor's budget committee to transfer funds from personal to non-personal services. In Florida, institutions now have a lump sum budget which will provide for greater provision for adjustment. Generally, however, delays do result in making adjustments and changes which cannot be forseen. No one is completely prescient. No one can tell a year or two years in advance exactly what is going to happen in the biology program; whether a new instrument will be needed. Current formula budgeting and current purchasing procedures in a number of states make it difficult to accomodate adjustments because they lack flexibility. Institutions in some states are fortunate in that they have a blanket budget or a budget in which they can transfer funds. However, about 50 to 60 percent of the institutions are not in this position.

Third, there is definitely much better control over program review than has been true before. In some cases, even if the coordinating body approves, there is a struggle with the legislature over whether or not the new programs will be implemented. It appears that program review is being more and more controlled in order to meet statewide needs rather than the desires of the faculty and the president.

The fourth key problem is the enormous cost of the development of data systems. For example, in one institution which became part of a centralized payroll it took six additional clerks to prepare the material to send to the control room to get a centralized payroll, which then took longer to get.

The fifth key problem is the cost in staff time. Presently throughout the country there is an increasing demand from legislatures that administrative staffs be cut. In Florida there is a study to determine all the administrative costs in order to cut a flat 15 percent. Much of this overhead for additional administrators has become necessary in the past 10 years in order to take care of the terrible push for meetings and time requirements in order to work things out in the central offices.

A forthcoming publication of the Carnegie Council contains material which should support institutions seeking flexibility. In a chapter on administrative independence and public accounting the Council recommends that accountability "be maintained through post audits." The state should exempt public higher education institutions from all state procedural controls, that is, all procedural controls mentioned above.

Additionally, public institutions should identify criteria to determine which procedural control should be opposed, in order to prevent state incursions into substantive areas; and which should be accepted, in particular those controls which pose little threat to necessary institutional independence, but which may result in state savings if voluntarily accepted.

The Carnegie Council report evaluating state systems contains a section I wrote entitled, "Can State Systems Adapt Models of Business Decentralization?" I think the concept has merit because many people will accept models from business which show profit as a measure of efficiency. State coordinating systems are very similar to the multi-companies that have developed throughout the country.

Successful business is measured easily in our system by its profit making capability. Multi-companies have tested federal decentralization and functional decentralization in order to design their organization systems for efficiency, effectiveness, optimum production, and a profit for, in some cases, many thousands of shareholders. Service organizations, which is what colleges and universities are, and governmental units are not subject to evaluation by the market on the basis of earned profits. They are subject to the market on the basis of student enrollments, but not in the same way that the business corporation is. Nevertheless, some of the characteristics of successful decentralized businesses may be useful in estimating potential success of service organizations, such as educational institutions, hospitals, and libraries.

There are many very large companies which use federal decentalization as a system. The people who operate the companies for the very large corporations are actually presidents, or in some vice presidents, of very large operations. Safeway and A & P food stores offer a good comparison in terms of efficiency. Safeway is about a $7 to $8 billion a year operation and so is A & P. A & P is highly centralized. Safeway is highly decentralized. This past year A & P lost money. Safeway made $50 billion.

Another example: Intelco and Genesco are two very comparable companies, both have over a billion dollars in yearly gross. Intelco is a decentralized company with operational controls left at the company level rather than in the central headquarters. Genesco is just the opposite. Intelco made about $50 million a year ago. Genesco lost just a little over $50 million.

In your own states you may be able to isolate companies run by very efficient managers who are doing very well on a decentralized basis. It doesn't mean that they have absolute autonomy to expand; they have to do the same things you do. They have to develop a budget, they have to develop goals for the next year, and they have to take care of seeing that this is approved by the central headquarters. However in these decentralized operations which are successful from the profit-making point of view there is a great deal of autonomy at operational levels, for example in equipment or purchasing.

The decentralization factor goes along with careful post-auditing. It also goes along with the fact that the manager is supposed to produce the results that were indicated in the budget. They seem to be very successful in doing this, and it may be a way to document the fact that in a free enterprise society, decentralization works better.

One final illustration on this point: Florida has prepared a special report on the need for flexibility. It estimates that if the chancellor's office and the state university system could get away from the architectural controls of the state, they can save $4.6 million.

In a recent speech, AASCU executive director Allan Ostar stated tha state colleges aren't beyond accountability. They are accountable to the public, accountable to students, and accountable to the society as a whole. They remain accountable if they are free to change in accordance with need. If the recent trend toward state-wide control continues, the pace of change in state colleges and universities will be slowed, if not stopped. The more centralized the decision-making becomes in the daily operation of the colleges, the harder it becomes for a campus to render decisions which affect the quality of its programs and needs of its students in its future objectives.

I believe that I detect two simultaneous movements going on. The first toward expansion of central office staffs and toward more operational controls as the central office grows. The second is a movement by legislators and concerned people in the states against the size of the central office staffs. It might be a propitious time for you to prove that you can do things just a little bit cheaper in your own institution than can be done within the excessive bureaucracies that essentially are controlling your delivery of service to students.

CHALLENGES OF THE PRESIDENCY
OR
BEYOND SURVIVAL

Kenneth E. Lindner
Chancellor
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

In preparation for this speech I reviewed the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, its problems and my challenges, and they seem so numerous that I hardly even knew where to start. And perhaps this is the key to at least a part of the problem. We are so busy with survival techniques, so occupied with hundreds of small problems, that we hardly have a chance to put the larger problems in perspective or priority. Running a university is like walking the beach; it isn't the boulders that are bothersome, it's the sand in your shoes that drives you crazy. A part of this trap in which we are caught, the sand in our shoes, results from the diversity of our operations. Where else, what other kind of enterprise, requires the top management person to run a hotel, a restaurant, a newspaper, a parking utility, a public relations program, a whole covey of professional athletic programs, a fleet of vehicles and perhaps of boats, and last, and unfortunately sometimes least, an educational enterprise. We are asked to do all of this working with a group of people, at least half of whom are sure that they could run it better, and the other half knowing very well that anyone could run it better. Furthermore, we are asked to do this with about one-third of the authority that anyone would normally have in trying to run any one of these enterprises.

So far I've said there are challenges. Perhaps I should be more specific. While there are others, there seem to be three major forces operating on higher education:

definition
centralization
financing and enrollment

I would like to speak briefly about the definition of higher education. I am greatly concerned that higher education is being defined, or at least perceived increasingly, as merely a system for producing people with appropriate backgrounds to accomplish certain tasks--as a vehicle to answer federal manpower need studies. The federal offices whistle the tune; we dance. Or--if we do not dance fast enough--they buy us with some kind of special categorical aids. What does this buy us? A glut of engineers yesterday, a glut of teachers today, a glut of nurses tomorrow, and a glut of physicians the next day. So I guess my first plea is this: let's remind ourselves of higher education's raison d'etre. As we make that redefinition, let us remember that a university must reflect the universe; it must give home and room to all that men know or aspire to know. We must keep in mind the main functions of higher education that go beyond the job skill orientation into which we are being pushed. Perhaps you saw the special issue of Saturday Review that looked forward to the year 2024. Fred Hechinger wrote in that issue, "By 2000, only the traditional liberal arts curriculum was considered permanently relevant. Harvard's quaint publication 'General Education in a Free Society,' originally issued in 1945, was reprinted and has remained a best seller ever since." This statement should keep us thinking about those things that are really relevant in higher education.

I simply cannot imagine anything more relevant to living in our everyday world than a good understanding of the cultural development of civilized peoples; first our own, and then others. That's what the liberal arts are all about.

History is the dynamic record of human affairs to which we all contribute. It's the bridge from past to future.

Literature reflects the reality of human experience, and the study of science is a search for the keys to that reality.

The liberal studies stress the reading, writing, and speaking of our own language. Surely there's nothing more relevant than that

The study of the liberal arts also develops an understanding of tolerance. Without this mark of the civilized person, we become barbarians again. Tolerance is really an acknowledgement of our own fallibility. It's proof of a willingness to re-examine our own position in the face of new evidence.

I don't have any intention of trying to redefine higher education tonight. I would only suggest that it needs to be done so that higher education does not become a tool of federal manpower studies or become completely career-oriented.

The second pressure on higher education is that of centralization. I will not deal at length with this topic. I recognize it as a pressure. I am a little disappointed when I hear us as institutional heads decry our loss of autonomy. I would only observe that if we in the university and they in central administration keep our heads screwed on right and approach together the problems of higher education, we can develop the tools and processes to solve the problems we now face--or at least ameliorate them. There are matters which can best be dealt with on a statewide basis. There are issues that must be dealt

with locally by an autonomous institution. The pressures of centralization will become positive pressures when we become better able to sort out the multitude of tasks in terms of where they are most effectively handled and then get on with it and work to solve them.

The third pressure is a two-headed monster: financing and enrollment changes.

We have had years of experience running institutions where the big problem each year was to be able to staff, produce the classrooms, and house the additional students who charged the university when fall came. The per-student allocation from state government seemed to be appropriate and very comfortable. We cranked the number of new students into the legislature and automatically, or nearly so, out came the additional dollars to educate them. The only area for haggling was the exact number of millions that would be additionally appropriated for new program development.

That all seemed to work well when we were growing. However, the growth days are past. The 18-year-old pool in Wisconsin will be 99,000 in the fall of 1978; in 1984 it will be 80,000, and in 1991 some 51,000. It is obvious that the old funding formulas do not serve the university faced with these projections.

In 1962, retiring Indiana University President Herman B Wells said, "Make the fecundity of the human race serve rather than defeat you. Look upon it as an asset giving you an opportunity to grow in curriculum and program. After all, you wouldn't know how to administer your institution unless it were growing."

I think he was really correct, in his last sentence at least. It is most difficult to administer an institution which is not growing--but statistics tell us we had better learn.

The pressure is there, we are all facing it. Funding formulas that work in a growth situation bring havoc and perhaps disaster in a time of declining student population.

All of these pressures are causing problems or perhaps challenges. Or, if you like to keep things in the positive as we do on our campus, refer to them as opportunities for change. In order to fulfill my commitment I want to speak on several specific challenges we have faced at the institution I head. I will limit myself to the following:

enrollment problems
staffing- tenure density problems
athletics-men's and women's

Enrollment Problems

A regularly increasing enrollment is, in a way, a great thing. It assures few, if any administrative mistakes. Each year the new flood of students, the new wave of faculty and the new transfusion of dollars simply cover up what happened--or didn't happen -- the year before. Each of you, I am sure, keeps your enrollment statistics on the tip of your tongue. It's your lifeblood--your claim to dollars. Reductions are traumatic.

What do we do about these enrollment problems? Of course our first reaction is to step up our recruiting activities. I recently received a reprint from the 15 May, 1975 Los Angeles Times, an article by Don Speich entitled--"Colleges Take Swing Down Madison Avenue, Glossy Sales Pitches Employed in New Era of Student Scarcity." I am sure you all received the article and I would commend it to you for your reading. It says clearly, just in case any of us are still refusing to hear, that Madison Avenue techniques won't work. I think we all really know that.

The faculty and students are the most effective public relations representatives of a university. When they believe in their institution, they will tell the world of their enthusiasm. Elaborately contrived public relations departments which do not command faculty respect are in the long run self-defeating. A university cannot be "sold" by Madison Avenue techniques used to sell cosmetics or automobiles. Those who believe otherwise do not understand the nature of the academic community and its product.

It really doesn't take much of a look at the statistics to realize that we had better put our heads together to learn how to cope with reality rather than to chase the enrollment rainbow of the past. It frightens me to think that Herman Wells may have been right in the quote I used earlier: "After all, you wouldn't know how to administer your institution unless it were growing."

Perhaps we can look beyond trauma. Perhaps if we can get to a steady state or to a funding system which does not overreact to enrollment fluctuations, we will be able to administer these institutions. Perhaps if (and this is a big if) we can lead ourselves through these traumatic, troubled times, we will reach the promised land. We will be able to run a university with our attention focused on the quality of the academic programs. We may be the administrators who have the opportunity to make decisions that are not, good or bad, completely obliterated by increase in size. We will be, and perhaps are now, the generation of college whose decisions really will have meaning for higher education.

Let me talk for a moment about enrollment as a statewide problem. If we agree that serious fluctuations in enrollments with concomitant fluctuations in funding are bad, then a statewide approach to enrollment equity may be desirable. We are engaged in such an experiment in Wisconsin. UW-La Crosse enrollments have been 7248, 7009, 6785, 6954, 7573, and the predictions for the 1976-77 academic year is 8050. Our fluctuations have not been nearly as serious as those at some other institutions where enrollments have kept dropping. To help stabalize enrollments we are using

a concept to which we refer as "targeted capacity enrollment." Four campuses of the 13 institutions in the UW System, including UW-La Crosse, have enrollment limits next year. Ours is 7600. This hopefully will direct more students to campuses which have serious enrollment declines, make it unnecessary to send more money to UW-La Crosse and make it unnecessary to reduce the budgets of the other institutions. I don't know how effective the system will be, but if it works, it will prevent the lay off of tenured faculty at some institutions and ensure that we do not try to build new facilities at some institutions while facilities at others go unused. It's a new concept--a whole new set of problems--to move from a posture of heavy recruiting, even praying for more students, to one where on July 7, today, we are sending letters to more than 900 freshmen students denying them admission. This demands flexibility on the part of an administrator and as for me, it boggles my mind.

My analysis of the enrollment problem is simple. The 18-year-old pool is reducing rapidly; but stability, when we reach it, will be real opportunity. Universities need specially talented and able leadership during the journey to the "promised land."

Staffing and Tenure Density Problems

On our march to the era of stability, one of the most difficult problems will be the handling of the tenure question. There is little doubt in my mind that we should be searching for alternatives to tenure; alternatives that give the same protection and guarantee to academic freedoms. This is a difficult problem to face because, to me, at least, academic freedom is a crucial cornerstone of the university and I have great difficulty in seperating tenure from this concept. While we are searching for alternatives, we must take precautions lest we destroy tenure. How can we--with the staff reductions we have been, and are being, forced to take--keep from destroying tenure? Perhaps we can't. Perhaps it is already too late. But we have taken steps in an attempt to keep tenure meaningful.

Using the Wisconsin 18-year-old pool as a base we predicted our enrollment through 1991. Within these enrollment parameters we estimated the credit production for each year for each department and, using that base, estimated the faculty necessary to produce those credits. We projected our present faculty over this period and reduced in years when retirements are due. The critical number is the faculty needed in 1991. We then made an administrative rule that no department can tenure more than 85 percent of the faculty needed in 1991.

We think this system will keep us from the institutional problems of having to give notice to tenured faculty. We hope this will sustain meaning to tenure and thus protect academic freedom.

Athletics

I want to touch briefly on this because it is a challenge which has been handled in an unbelievably bad manner. We have a new chance now and I am afraid all we intend to do is repeat our errors.

I don't want anyone to think I don't support athletics; I support them and enjoy them immensely. I am proud of our teams and I take particular pride in UW-La Crosse taking second place in the NAIA all sports award. But let's look at what most universities are doing. We have watched the "big boys" and have joined the rush to buy talent, and to buy it with dollars that we simply can't afford to use for these purposes--dollars that need to be invested in our academic programs. What do we get for the money we put into athletic grants in aid, or whatever title we use to convince ourselves that we aren't just hiring people to perform for us? That is the simple question we must pose to ourselves. What specifically do we get for the money spent? An answer which describes the value of an athletic program is not an acceptable answer. I, too, accept the value of the program, but I would submit to you that exactly the same outcomes can be realized by not spending a cent for "free rides" or "grants in aid."

My belief is that our comprehensive system of financial aids should apply to all students and should be sufficient for all students. I believe further athletics is indeed a valuable part of collegiate experience--and like other collegiate experiences, students need not be paid.

Now we are faced with Title IX regulations designed to give women opportunity for the same kinds of valuable collegiate athletic experiences we have in the past given to men. Instead of welcoming this opportunity, we hear people shouting that this will destroy college athletics. Patent nonsense. The time is now. Title IX is opportunity. We can, if we wish, put athletics in its proper perspective and make it an important part of our university programs for both men and women--for those who want to participate on an unpaid basis. We can do this right now and demonstrate real leadership.

To be realistic, no school can do this alone. However athletic conferences can, but certainly won't, unless people like you take a firm leadership position.

In closing I would repeat a small part of what I said earlier because it illustrates the real challenge of the presidency. We need to lead our institutions through the trauma of change to the "promised land" of steady state, in which full attention and resources can be directed toward building and sustaining academic programs of the highest quality available to all people of our society.

EVALUATING INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Kenneth Young
President
Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

COPA stands for the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. I emphasized the word Postsecondary for reasons that I think will become clear in my remarks. I do want to point out that we are located in One Dupont Circle and we are the only organization at One Dupont Circle with the word Postsecondary in our title. COPA came into being as a result of a merger between the National Commission on Accrediting and the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions for Higher Education. NCA, as you may know, had been in busness for 25 years, functioning on behalf of colleges and universities to monitor and restrain the specialized accrediting activities that have proliferated so fast in recent years. At the time that NCA went out of business it had recognized 36 accrediting bodies which were accrediting 3600 programs in 48 distinct disciplines or areas of postsecondary studies. FRACHE, on the other hand, was an organization that was created by the six regional accrediting commissions as a mechanism for getting together and sharing ideas and developing greater uniformity of activities among the regional accredition bodies. At the time that FRACHE went out of business, it had within its ranks nine commissions as several of the regions have more than one commission functioning at the postsecondary level. Nine commissions within the six regional bodies accrediting approximately 2400 institutions.

So COPA represents all the amalgamations of all of this activity. In addition, while they were organizing COPA they decided to bring in everything else that could appropriately be brought in; so the four national organizations that have been accrediting specialized institutions, the American Association of Bible Colleges, the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools, which accredits primarily business schools, National Association of Trade and Technical Schools and the National Home Study Council, also became part of COPA. Those four organizations accredit about 1000 institutions and three of those organizations, AICS, NATTS, and NHSC, accredit primarily proprietary schools. Thus, COPA represents regional and national accrediting, and institutional and specialized accrediting of public, private and proprietary institutions. In short, almost everything.

There are a few groups still not represented, and they want to get in. There is an accrediting organization for the School of Cosmetology accrediting about 800 cosmetology schools which has indicated a desire for consideration for entry into COPA. There are chiropractors, proprietary law schools, biblical schools, all sorts of things that are being accredited in one form or another and want to become part of this single voice which is intended to represent all of postsecondary education. In addition, if this isn't complicated enough, COPA also has as supporting member organizations, seven organizations representative of institutions, of your institutions among others. They are: the American Council on Education, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Universities, the Association of Urban Universities, and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

You can see we are a real amalgam. I have a board of 36 members. The 36 people on that board come by way of designation from these various representative groups that go to make up COPA. Nine of the members of the board are public members. Representing AASCU on the board is Leo Jenkins, whom you all know. I think we have a fine set of officers: Lloyd Elliot, president of George Washington University, is chairman of our board; Dana Hammill, chancellor of the Virginia State Community College System, is vice chairman; and Lloyd Koffer, chairman of the board at Central Michigan University, is secretary-treasurer. Enough about COPA, let me move more into the topic of the assignment, "Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness."

As I considered that title, I said to myself there are three questions that need to be answered: what is an institution, who does the evaluating and how, and what do we mean by effectiveness.

It seems to me that we are facing a number of developments that are radically changing what we have always thought of as the definition of an institution; which creates real problems when we talk about evaluating institutional effectiveness. As a matter of fact, it seems to me we are moving into what is now being called a learning society. First of all, the universe which we have known as higher education has been changed; it's been radically enlarged into a universe now being called postsecondary education. Most people thought of this as merely recognition of the fact that we are no longer going to concentrate solely on the traditional college student population of the 18- to 22-year olds and recognize that all kinds of people are going to be going to school, or are in fact going to school one way or another, most of their lives. We have talked about continuing education, and recurrent education, but I think this expansion is larger and much more meaningful.

For one thing, I think that the change that is occurring here, I won't go into all the reasons for it, represents an ending of the traditional monopoly of organized education of which we are a part. And it is not only a recognition that there are things out there called proprietary schools which are now being funded by the Federal Government in the same manner as private and public institutions; but also a recognition that education at the postsecondary level is being sponsored by business and industry, by labor unions, and by voluntary associations. If you don't believe this is a significant and a big enterprise, go visit, for instance, the Xerox Learning Center that has been built out in Virginia, not too far from Dulles Airport. Or go visit McDonald's Hamburger University in Oakbrook, Illinois. Or go visit the Community College of the Air Force which is really a gigantic computerized registrar's office which keeps track of the educational and training activities of every person in the Air Force, whatever training center they happen to be located at.

Postsecondary education is so big nobody really knows all that is out there yet. No one has been able to count the number of institutions, the number of students, or the variety of activities. The Office of Education and the National Center for Educational Statistics have been making some stabs at getting a hold on this, but they still don't know. Even in the proprietary area they are not sure whether there are 8,000 or 10,000 schools. The other thing that I think is important is that organized education is also in the process of losing control of the credits and credentials system on which our monopoly has been built over the years. We now see students getting degrees by correspondence, by examination, through proprietary schools and from military sponsored educational programs. Several military installations have been qualified for degree-granting status. We have accredited institutions now represented in the military Community College of the Air Force. This is an accredited institution of postsecondary education. We have degree granting institutions in that postsecondary area. We have something new called the continuing education unit which increasingly is being used by professional groups as a means of measuring effort and giving credit, not toward degrees but toward job requirements or professional requirements. I think it is going to play an increasingly important role in our country.

Another thing that's happening, partly in response to the expanded credit offerings and partly in response to other developments, is the introduction of some major changes in traditional higher education. Institutions are going after new student clienteles, they are introducing new kinds of curricula, they are introducing new approaches to teaching and learning, and they are developing new criteria for academic credit. Credit is being given for work, for service experience, for self-study, even for travel. Course credit for supervised group travel has been coming for a long time; but I learned recently that some institutions are giving credit for individual travel. You go down to the travel agency, make your plans up, go back to the institution and submit your travel plan, and after you finish it you come back and turn in a report and get your three credits. Institutions also are expanding physically in a new way: there are satelite campus operations all over the country now. In the Washington, D.C. area alone there are 26 different institutions not located in Washington, D.C. which offer course work in that area, mostly at the graduate level. Institutions like University of Southern California, University of Oklahoma, University of Northern Colorado, are offering work the year round in the Washington, D.C. area. Antioch, of course, has a network all over the country; Laverne College is offering courses all over; and you've heard of the activities of Nova University. There are all kinds of interesting and difficult things, difficult from the point of view of accreditation. We have universities without walls, we have all sorts of new things that have changed traditional higher education so that the word traditional now has to be put in quotes, it seems to me.

In addition to the fact that we are moving into a new learning society--and I want to elaborate on that as I go along--we also are moving into multi-campus systems. Fred Harcleroad had some things to say about that yesterday and the implications of it were also discussed in the session that Karl Meyer headed up on the "Impact of Centralization," so I won't elaborate on that. You know more than I do about what's happening as far as multi-campus system developments.

The third point, and this is of concern to me and I think should be to you, is that I think traditional higher education is experiencing a number of losses in what I would call institutional integrity. I don't mean to challenge your integrity; I mean the ability of an institution to function as an institution. You're subjected to extra-institutional forces, the Federal government being one, with a variety of implications; state government, and I'll elaborate on these; 1202 commissions which represent really a combination of both Federal and state activities and interests; and accreditation, itself. All of these forces compel institutions to do certain things, or to do certain things certain ways.

Also, there are intra-institutional forces that happen to have access to outside leverage, and they make use of this outside leverage. Many of you have collective bargaining now so you have labor unions on your campus which are able through their membership within the state and nationwide union organization to exert considerable outside leverage. This is particularly true when union contracts are negotiated statewide, and the union really is negotiating with the governor's office or an arm of the governor's office, and the results of those negotiations are then forced upon the campus and the president has to live with them. This is a very important kind of intra-institutional force that has outside dimensions to it.

Another intra-institutional pressure is the activity

of professional organizations, which you may have forgotten, having lived with it for so long. The extent to which your faculty identify with their profession and use that professional organization can exert significant pressure on the institution in a number of ways. I am concerned particularly with two of them. One, certification and professional groups working with states are able to control, in most instances, certain aspects of your institution by determining requirements for certification and accreditation. We still face the problem of increasing proliferation of professional and specialized groups wanting to come in to institutions and accredit separately and discreetly the specific specialized programs with which they have an interest. We are not being helped in this regard by activities at the federal level. There has been legislation and there is more legislation. There are bills floating around now in Washington that would specify specialized accreditation. The legislation would say that in order to be eligible for certain kinds of federal funds, for instance in the health manpower area, it is not enough that the program be located in an accredited institution. That program must be specifically accredited by a specialized accrediting group. In some instances the proposed legislation names a specialized area where there is no specialized accrediting group. So the effect of the legislation would be to create even additional specialized accreditation.

The second question, who evaluates and how? Everyone evaluates your institution, as you well know it, in one way or another. Students, parents, faculty, administrators, non-academic personnel, the general public, or, more accurately, the various publics who have special interests, the media increasingly as they find out that it makes good copy to come in and take a very critical look at what you are doing, and of course the government itself--both state and federal, executive, legislative, and judicial. Increasingly the courts are getting into the act, passing judgment on something or other that you are doing as this matter comes to them in the form of litigation.

These evaluations seem to have certain qualities in common. Maybe I shouldn't call them qualities. By and large they are informal, subjective, they stem from a limited perspective of what your institution is doing or should be doing, and they represent varying expectations about what you should be doing. You have a concern, of course, with all forms of evaluation. However, it seems to me that the most crucial kinds of evaluation from your point of view have to be those tied to some form of control. If there is one theme that has been coming through this meeting it is that you believe that you are in danger of losing control over those elements necessary in determining the scope and mission and effectiveness of your institution.

The most crucial areas in which evaluation is accompanied by control (or to put it another way, areas in which quality control mechanisms are functioning) have to do with the federal government, which charters certain institutions itself such as the military academies, Gallaudet Colleges, Howard University, and now increasingly, it is chartering certain military institutions by congressional action. The Federal government approves certain institutions and programs for funds, for instance, the Federal Aviation Administration approves flight training schools and programs throughout the country. The first form of accreditation was by the Department of Agriculture of veterinary schools way back in the early 1900s. The Federal government now is qualifying certain institutions for federal funds and, in effect, accrediting. The little known Mansfield Amendment reached in to state that public vocational institutions recognized at the state level would automatically qualify for federal funds and would not need to be accredited in any other fashion. Through the Veterans Administration, the Federal government has created state approval agencies which recognize institutions for Veterans Administration benefits, G.I. Bill benefits. Of course, as you well know, the Federal government, though the Office of Education, has created an accreditation and institutional eligibility staff which functions to recognize accrediting agencies whose activities in turn are accepted by the Federal government for qualifying for federal funds. The Federal government also provides fund directly to institutions and indirectly through states, to faculty, and to students through the various student aid programs.

The Federal government also polices legislation. You are rapidly having to come to terms with the activities in this area, such as affirmative action, consumer protection, and other areas, which I feel are becoming so onerous, so overwhelming, that they pose among the greatest problems in higher education today.

And the Federal government audits. It conducts financial audits, of course, to the extent that you have contracts and grants from the Federal government. These audits, particularly for the larger contracts, can and do become much more than financial audits. There are examples of auditing teams which, after a preliminary look at the institution, have sat down with the president and said we are not satisfied with the director or the competency of the director of this program, and in order for us to continue to provide money under this contract you must remove that director and bring in another, or make other changes in the program. For good reason, perhaps, in most cases, but for questionable reasons in others. And in any case, it seems to me that this kind of leverage--forcing institutions to function in a different manner--represents a rather serious threat.

An official of an institution recently reported that two auditors concerned with affirmative action visited the campus unannounced. Moreover, they had had no complaint, they said they just decided it was time to take a look at this particular institution. They demanded access to all of the records. They spent several days looking at the records, and they came back to the head of this institution and said we are concerned about two problems here. First, there is

Professor A and Professor B: they are both about the same age, they both have the same degrees, they both have been with your institution about the same period of time, one is teaching English, and one is a Certified Public Accountant, teaching accounting in the School of Business Administration. There is a $5,000 difference in their pay level, and we don't think this is in line with the spirit of affirmative action. And the head of that institution had difficulty persuading these federal auditors that the market place functions in such a way that in order to get a good Certified Public Accountant he would have to pay $5,000 more than he would have to pay in order to get a good professor of English. Secondly, they pointed to two more professors, again very comparable in every way but salary. The head of the institution pointed out that the one man had made it clear when he came that he did not wish to participate in any committee work; he taught his classes and he went home. The other man was active on five important committees in the institution. The federal auditor said well, okay, we can see that but we want you to put a dollar value on each of those committees in order to make a case for the salary differential. These kinds of things are funny, but I think they are rather terrifying.

The federal government is a quality control force. It functions in a variety of ways to evaluate your institution, and evaluates it with clout so that you have to listen to judgments that are made.

The state does the same thing. The state functions to register, license, and certify individuals directly, through institutions, and cooperatively through professions. And this in turn has a feedback effect. It has implications for what you do or don't do as you prepare people who are intended to qualify for that registering, licensing, and certification. The state government, of course, charters institutions and it approves institutions and programs for its own purposes and, as I mentioned earlier, for federal purposes. The state provides funds directly to institutions, and indirectly through state scholarship programs. And the state again audits institutions, and there are fiscal audits and there are performance audits. Fred Harcleroad was telling me just yesterday about some information he had that indicates an increasing tendency on the part of states to engage in performance auditing and to establish staffs if they don't already have them to function in this manner. This would be different from your legislative auditor if, in your particular state, you happen to have a legislative auditor.

The other force is nongovernmental accreditation, which I represent. We see some real changes happening here. I won't go into the details of accreditation; I assume you have lived with it long enough to know a lot about it. When I was a president I didn't think about accreditation very often, In fact, I didn't think about it at all until the dean or someone reminded me that it was time to get ready for the next accreditation visit, in which case I muttered under my breath. The fact that presidents don't think about accreditation often enough is a challenge. I am reminded of the experience of the Goodyear Tire Company a number of years ago. They hired a company to survey the public to find out what the public attitude was about tires, and after a nationwide survey, the survey firm found that people never think about tires really until they get a flat, and then they are very unhappy about tires. Goodyear had to approach the problem of dealing with the public, recognizing this difficulty.

I think the same thing is true of accreditation. Presidents don't think about accreditation until they have to go through a process which is time-consuming, which takes their attention away from something else, and which is costly and burdensome, and therefore there are very negative feelings about accreditation. I hope that some of the things that I have to say today will convince you that accreditation is extremely important to you; that preservation of voluntary accreditation is extremely important to you; and therefore that support of COPA is something that you should back enthusiastically.

Some changes are occurring in accreditation. We are seeing a broadening of the scope of institutional accrediting. First, there are agencies which accredit specialized institutions of various kinds, such as the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools and the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools. Also, the regionals, in some cases reluctantly, but, I think, inevitably, are beginning to recognize that they must accredit all kinds of postsecondary education within their region. A few years ago in the Marjory Webster College case, Middle States took the position that they did not wish to go through the process of accrediting proprietary schools. They saw themselves as an instrumentality created by nonprofit institutions of higher education and functioning to accredit only those kinds of institutions. The court, in a rather controversial decision on appeal, supported Middle States in its position.

Now, very quietly after having won that point, it is interesting to see that in the past year or two Middle States is accrediting proprietary institutions. The first one, I think, was the Rand Institute in the Boston-Cambridge area. All over the country now the regionals are faced with the question of accrediting certain kinds of institutions that have not been thought of customarily as traditional higher education. These institutions are coming forward and saying we would like to stand for consideration of accreditation. The regionals are moving to accredit these kinds of institutions. I think we will see regional accreditation being applied to a very broad spectrum of institutions represented within postsecondary education, rather than being limited to those within the traditional higher education framework.

Also, there is increasing use of accreditation for determining eligibility for federal funds. This, on the one hand, is giving accreditation much more clout. More people want accreditation in order to qualify for federal funds. But it also raises some

very unsettling questions. Accreditation was a concept of force in this country long before the federal government started giving out monies on the basis of accreditation. It seems to me that one of the great potential dangers is that the Federal government, by dangling dollars, may end up taking over accreditation and forcing it to become something that it was not originally intended to be. Although I think evidence of institutional quality is important in qualifying for federal funds, I think accreditation, with all of its imperfections, is the best indicator we have of institutional quality today. That is the major issue with which COPA is wrestling.

Additionally, the accreditation activity is moving from what I would call loss control to gain maximization (those are terms I think I heard from a graduate of a business school). When accreditation first started the major concern was to identify those institutions which weren't good enough and to make sure they didn't get accredited. Increasingly, accreditation places greater emphasis on working with institutions which are quite good to help them identify areas which they ought to be improving to become even better kinds of institutions. Accreditation also is moving from an overwhelming concern with process to a greater concern with product, with outcomes. It is getting away from mere quantitative measures, such as books in the library and Ph.D.'s on the faculty, to measures which determine quality, and that is not easy to do.

Accreditation starts with an institution's own statement of its scope and mission. Accreditation is not intended to tell an institution what it ought to be. Accreditation does have to begin with certain assumptions about the value, the initial value, of what an institution is doing. But by and large we work within an institution's own statement of scope and mission. A key to the accreditation process as it has developed over the years is the institutional self study; the accreditation functions to force the institution to take a look at itself.

The other key element is peer evaluation, so-called expert opinion from persons from other institutions, brought in as part of the visiting team and serving on the regional commission that acts to make decisions about the qualifications of an institution for accredited status, and to make recommendations about how an institution can improve itself.

We recognize there are many vulnerabilities in the accrediting process and we are trying very hard to improve it. We are sponsoring a project started under the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education (FRACHE) two years ago with a grant from the Danforth Foundation and headed up by Norman Burns of the North Central Association, which is working with ten institutions across the country, two-year, four-year, public and private. Its purpose is to help them improve their own self study process and to move to a greater emphasis on outcomes, rather than on the traditional measures of institutional quality.

The regional groups met over the years with FRACHE, and will continue to meet under COPA sponsorship, to develop greater uniformity and comparability: definitions of terms, criteria and procedures. We will sponsor training programs to improve the skills of people who serve on visiting teams and on accrediting commissions.

There undoubtedly will be new approaches for experimentation. For example, the American Institutes for Research (AIR) is developing an equivalent of the HEGIS report for non-HEGIS institutions, which means the vocational technical institutions, including the proprietary schools. So there soon will be a national report form that these institutions will be required to fill out. In addition, AIR will be developing a student evaluation form that will be administered on a sample basis to non-HEGIS institutions to determine student satisfaction with the kinds of vocational programs they are getting. AIR also will create a form for use with alumni on a follow-up basis after five years, ten years, fifteen years. The project is intended to discover, among other things, whether persons who have gone through proprietary school training, or through other vocational technical institutions, consider it as valuable after a period of years; both in obtaining the initial job and in continuing within that profession or occupation. Thus, there are a number of ways in which the accrediting process is trying to improve.

In addition to federal, state, and accreditation, the fourth mechanism of evaluation and quality control is the institution itself: internal evaluation. Most institutions, in my judgment, do not really evaluate themselves. They don't look at the competition, they don't look at the environment in which thay are located, and they don't re-examine the institution's statement of objectives critically to ask are these objectives appropriate, are they stated in ways that can be assessed, and do we really accomplish them. They don't use data that is readily available to them. Here I speak from my experience with the American College Testing Program. The ACT and SAT provide a tremendous amount of data that can be used, not only for recruiting and admitting students, but for evaluating the institution: its effectiveness in getting a proportion of students out of an appropriate pool, and the quality of those students versus the ones who went elsewhere; profiles of the students who enroll, and what happens to these kinds of students. Institutions don't use the data. They require students to take the SAT or ACT and to pay for it; they get the computer printout, it goes into the computer center or, if they are not quite that sophisticated, it ends up in individual student folders, and apparently no one ever looks at it again. Alexander Astin each year conducts for the American Council on Education a survey of freshmen. He releases his annual analysis of that data, but again he says that very few institutions bother him about trying to get breakdowns of that data. Most institutions operate on folklore: statements believed by most people involved in higher education, yet never validated.

Institutional evaluation of educational effectiveness also should be re-examined. Over the years we have depended upon grades and test scores to determine which students to admit and how well students were doing. Grades and test scores correlate very highly with one another. Grades from high school correlate highly with undergraduate grades, and grades in undergraduate college correlate highly with grades in graduate school and professional school. All of these correlate highly with test scores, and one test score correlates very highly with another. Basically these measures assess verbal ability, reading speed, reading comprehension, vocabulary, producing a consistent measure of the particular ability which increasingly is being referred to as academic ability.

However, we must develop better ways of understanding and evaluating the socially useful talents in addition to that which we call academic ability: the talent of working with people, the talent of working with objects. We must develop better ways of understanding and evaluating the means of different learning styles: moving from the concrete to the abstract, from the specific to the general; moving from highly structured and supervised educational experiences to self-initiated and self-directed education. We must evaluate the effectiveness of various educational studies.

We must also begin to focus more on educational outcomes. There are problems with outcomes. We have good measures of inputs. Many institutions collect the data although they don't use it very well. However, we do not yet have very good measures of educational outcomes, and the biggest reason is that most faculty are unable or unwilling to define the expected outcomes in ways which lend themselves to evaluation. I remember a conversation I had with a very bright young political scientist at SUNY, Courtland when I was there, in which I suggested that it would be nice if he could tell us what he expected as a result of a semester or a year of political science. And he got very indignant. He said that it challenged every belief about the nature of the educational process. The nature of the educational process is you get a good professor, you get some bright interested students, you put them together in an appropriate environment, and something worthwhile is bound to happen. There is no way to predict the outcome, and the extent to which you intrude and try to predict or control the outcome damages the process. There are people who believe that and a case can be made.

But I would suggest that public expectations are such that developing demands for accountability at the federal level and the state level and among the general public are not going to allow us to take that kind of a position. I think we've got to be able to say what it is that we expect students to be able to do as a result of a given educational experience. Faculty, not only for the reasons mentioned by this bright young professor but for other reasons, don't enthusiastically leap to this challenge. One, it is difficult to do. It's really difficult to sit down and write out educational outcomes that can be evaluated; outcomes that are important and meaningful and not just easily evaluated. The best things that you want to do are the hardest things to evaluate. Also, and we must face this fact, evaluation of the educational process, evaluation of students, poses a great threat of evaluation of faculty. Faculty members are smart enough to recognize this. So I think faculty always will resist this.

There are some promises on the horizon. I mentioned the Danforth project. The institutions participating in that are quite enthusiastic about it. I don't wish to overemphasize the potential of the results of this project. At best it will be a modest step in the direction of identifying outcomes, but not the final step.

There is a very interesting project now being carried out by the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (CASC). This is ironic. CASC was organized not too many years ago as an organization to work with very small, private institutions, two-year and four-year, which were struggling with limited finances. Most of them were unaccredited institutions and they couldn't get funds from foundations which required accreditation as qualification. CASC was organized and given some money to help these institutions get accredited. They are now working on a project with a half million dollar grant, which is a follow-up to an earlier, smaller project to develop within their member institutions ongoing continuing processes of institutional evaluation. These institutions are going to have, if this project succeeds, a mechanism for collecting and evaluating data about each institution every year, year by year, which will measure how well it is doing. They feel they have to do this in order to survive as institutions in an increasingly competitive world.

Another promising development is contained in the publication "Educational Auditing," written by Frank Dickey and Fred Harcleroad and published by the Eric Clearing House on Higher Education a few months ago. The concept is a parallel to the financial audit to which institutions are subjected every year. An educational audit would be made every year, so that a specific rundown and report by certain kinds of indicators would profile the educational status of the institution, just as the financial status of the institution is furnished now.

And finally, it seems to me we need to come to terms with what we already know. Arthur W. Chickering wrote, "The major task confronting higher education is not to generate new complex and subtle understandings, but to act on knowledge already available, to recognize principles of learning and human development already clearly established. The gap between what is known and what is done must be narrowed."

I earlier mentioned the grip of folklore. It seems strange that presidents continue to operate on folklore, and ignore the findings of research. For example, research says that changes in attitudes and values do take place in students and persist through

life as a result of going to college. Going to college does strengthen desirable values that otherwise might have been reversed. The image of a college significantly determines the kind of student attracted to it. Impacts at different colleges vary according to the types of students who attend them. Faculty members are not responsible for any significant changes that take place in students. Small residential colleges most frequently offer the best conditions to exert desirable and uniform effects on student development. A big challenge for AASCU is to take whatever steps are necessary to find ways which will improve the impact on students; recognizing that in most cases AASCU institutions are larger than many of the private institutions and have much larger groups of commuter students. Research indicates, and it is rather obvious, that if you have a smaller group to work with, and if you can get them into an environment and keep them there for longer periods of time, you can have a greater impact upon them. I think AASCU institutions need to be concerned with improvement in this particular area. So-called "better" colleges--ivy league, for example--are better primarily because of the academic ability of the students they admit. And these colleges have less impact on their students than other less selective institutions in terms of intellectual development. What this says is that Harvard admits students who already are at a high level of development. Other institutions may admit students who are at a lower level and as a result of four years at that institution, they reach a higher level. The impact of that institution is much greater than the so-called prestigious institutions and Alexander Astin has done considerable research on this.

Academic success as measured by grades and test scores has little or no relationship to success in later life. However you measure success in later life--whether you talk about salary earned or advancement through career ladders, or employer ratings of employees or employee satisfaction--none of these measures show any significant relationship to academic performance as measured by grades and test scores in your institutions. They even include professional shools and graduate schools.

I hope that someday we will see a situation in which every institution of postsecondary education, because of the challenges of the learning society, economic pressures, and enrollment pressures, rethinks and restates its educational objectives; stressing the institution's quality in terms of value or worth to a defined student clientele which that institution is best qualified to seek out and serve. Objectives which are stated in ways that readily lend themselves to evaluation so that institutions can determine whether they succeeded totally, or succeeded to this extent with this number of students, in doing what they set out to do. Frankly, there are very few institutions which know that today.

I hope that every institution develops a continuing institutional evaluation, the same way that the struggling CASC institutions are beginning to do. An institutional evaluation designed to determine how well that institution is doing what it says it is doing. Furthermore, that every institution subjects itself to an annual educational audit along the lines suggested by Dickey and Harcleroad, by qualified outside observers, just as a financial audit is produced. I would like to see every institution include in its official catalog a short report containing essential information from that audit for the benefit of prospective students so that they can better know what they are getting into and they can make better decisions about which institution to attend and which program to enter. Every institution would have available on request a long form resulting from that audit that would be available to anyone interested in seeing it; and it also would provide the Federal government with the information it asks for on its HEGIS form and the information requested by various state agencies.

It also would serve the purposes of accreditation if regional accrediting groups could get these annual statements. It might reduce the cost of accreditation borne by an institution because an accrediting team would not have to visit the institution until such time as warning flags appear. If they can look at these reports, year by year, certain information should start to show up. If enrollments are falling drastically or other kinds of things are happening, then warning flags will appear. At that point it might be necessary and desirable to have a group come in and talk about what's going on. But otherwise, is it really necessary every five years, or however long, to have an institution put up with the cost and burden of a visiting team when it is doing a perfectly good job without having that visit? As a result of this, there would be no requirement for a special self study because the annual institutional evaluation and the educational audit procedure would substitute for that process. There would be no more need for extra report forms to be sent to the Federal government and to state governments, and no more expensive accrediting visits, except when the warning flags suggest it.

Back in 1965, Don K. Price, in a book called "The Scientific Estate," wrote, "The more an institution or function is concerned with truth, the more it deserves freedom from political control. The more an institution or function is concerned with the exercise of power, the more it should be controlled by the processes of responsibility to elected authorities and ultimately to the electorate." There has been much talk at the Summer Council about the increasing burdens and dangers of political control. You will never be completely free of these problems; the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. However, controls will become ever more onerous, it seems to me, unless you take the necessary steps to define clearly your institution's role to evaluate critically your institution's effectiveness and to communicate fully what you know. And only the president can cause this to happen. You are the only one who sees the total institution. This is an area where you do have authority.

There are increasing restrictions: rigidities within the institution brought about by collective bargaining, highly tenured faculty, stabilizing enrollments, and reduced budgets; and the outside intrusions mentioned above. The president is confronted with a more and more restricted role in so many areas, particularly the political, economic, and financial areas of his institution. But the one area in which the president can exert control is the educational area.

Presidents have felt quite limited in this area because they are the generalists dealing with the specialists. The economics department can rightfully say they know a lot more about economics than the president. But there is nobody in the institution other than the president in a position to be concerned about the total educational program. There is no one else who has both the authority and the responsibility to ask the right questions of the faculty. On her deathbed Gertrude Stein is alleged to have turned to her friends and said, "What is the answer?" Nobody responded and finally she said, "What is the question?" and turned over and died. You are in a position to ask what is the answer and then to ask what you think is the question. You need to ask your people the kind of questions that you know you are going to be asked by state officials, by federal officials, and by accrediting bodies. You can only get off the defensive by going on the offensive. If you ask the questions first, if you set into operation techniques and activities to produce the answers, you're not going to be running scared because of these outside pressures. And you are going to be in a more effective position to respond to criticism: public criticism, media criticism, and criticism from the legislature. Only the president can do this. I hope that you will set about that task immediately. COPA and the accrediting community stand ready to help you with that process in any way we can.